

P20746, A02

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Upon entry of the above amendment, claims 1-10 will have been canceled and claims 11-17 will have newly been submitted for reconsideration by the Examiner. In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the outstanding rejections of all the claims pending in the present application. Such action is respectfully requested and is now believed to be appropriate and proper.

Initially, Applicant would like to express his appreciation to the Examiner for the detailed Official Action provided, for the acceptance of the drawings filed in the present application on July 16, 2001, and for the acknowledgment of Applicant's Claim for Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 and receipt of the certified copies of the priority documents in the Official Action.

Applicant also notes with appreciation the Examiner's acknowledgment of Applicant's Information Disclosure Statement filed in the present application on October 24, 2001 by the return of the initialed and signed PTO-1449 Form, and for consideration of the documents cited in the Information Disclosure Statement.

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner objected to the declaration as being unsigned by the inventor. Applicant respectfully traverses.

In particular, an executed declaration was filed in the present application on September 10, 2001. A copy of the same together with a copy of the mailroom date-stamped receipt evidencing the filing of the same are attached to complete the record of the application.

Turning to the merits of the action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-2 and 4-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by MORI (U.S. Patent No. 6,384,927).

P20746. A02

The Examiner also has rejected claims 3 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over MORI (U.S. Patent No. 6,384,927) in view of IZAWA et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,754,335).

As noted above, Applicant has canceled claims 1-10, and has submitted new claims 11-17. Applicant respectfully traverses the above rejection based on the newly added claims 11-17 and will discuss the outstanding rejection with respect to these claims in the present application as will be set forth hereinbelow. The newly added claims merely clarify the subject matter recited in the canceled claims, but do not narrow the scope of the claims.

Applicant's claims 11-15 generally relate to a facsimile apparatus which transmits image data to a relay Internet facsimile apparatus via PSTN. The relay Internet facsimile apparatus transmits the image data to a plurality of receiving Internet facsimile apparatus via the Internet. The facsimile apparatus has an input device which inputs image data and a panel configured to input predetermined information identifying the relay Internet facsimile apparatus and a plurality of sub-addresses of the receiving Internet facsimile apparatuses. The relay Internet facsimile apparatus has a memory that stores a plurality of IP addresses of the receiving Internet facsimile apparatuses corresponding to the plurality of the sub-addresses of the receiving Internet facsimile apparatuses. The facsimile apparatus comprises a controller which, when the predetermined information and the plurality of the sub-addresses of the receiving Internet facsimile apparatuses are input by the panel, transmits, to the relay Internet facsimile apparatus via the PSTN, the input image data and the plurality of the input sub-addresses of the receiving Internet facsimile apparatuses, based on the input

P20746, A02

predetermined information identifying the relay Internet facsimile apparatus. Then, the relay Internet facsimile apparatus converts the transmitted image data into data for Internet transmission and relays the converted data to the plurality of the receiving Internet facsimile apparatuses via the Internet, based on the plurality of the IP addresses of the receiving Internet facsimile apparatuses corresponding to the plurality of sub-addresses of the receiving Internet facsimile apparatuses stored in the memory. Claim 16 recites a related relay Internet facsimile apparatus. Claim 17 recites a related method.

In direct contrast, MORI relates to a system in which a first repeater Internet facsimile machine is installed in the same country as the transmitting machine, the first repeater Internet facsimile machine transfers the image information to a second repeater Internet facsimile machine, the second repeater Internet facsimile machine is installed in a different country from the first repeater Internet facsimile machine, and the second repeater Internet facsimile apparatus is installed in the same country as the recipient machine.

However, MORI merely discloses operations of the first repeater Internet facsimile machine and the second repeater Internet facsimile machine, but does not contain any disclosures about operations of the transmitting facsimile machine. For example, all flowcharts (Figs. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, and 27) describe operations of the first repeater Internet facsimile machine and the second repeater Internet facsimile machine, but the flowcharts do not contain any disclosures about operations of the transmitting facsimile machine.

P20746. A02

Further, MORI does not disclose a facsimile apparatus which transmits image data via a relay Internet facsimile apparatus to a plurality of receiving Internet facsimile apparatuses. Rather, MORI merely discloses a transmitting facsimile machine which transmits a sub-address of a receiving facsimile machine. Thus, MORI also does not disclose a facsimile apparatus which inputs predetermined information identifying the relay Internet facsimile apparatus and a plurality of sub-addresses of the receiving Internet facsimile apparatuses. Further, MORI does not disclose a facsimile apparatus which, when the predetermined information and the plurality of the sub-addresses of the receiving Internet facsimile apparatuses are input by the panel, transmits, to the relay Internet facsimile apparatus, the input image data and the plurality of the input sub-addresses of the receiving Internet facsimile apparatuses, based on the input predetermined information identifying the relay Internet facsimile apparatus.

On the other hand, the present invention recites a facsimile apparatus which transmits image data via a relay Internet facsimile apparatus to a plurality of receiving Internet facsimile apparatuses, inputs predetermined information identifying the relay Internet facsimile apparatus and a plurality of sub-addresses of the receiving Internet facsimile apparatuses, and when the predetermined information and the plurality of the sub-addresses of the receiving Internet facsimile apparatuses are input by the panel, transmits, to the relay Internet facsimile apparatus, the input image data and the plurality of the input sub-addresses of the receiving Internet facsimile apparatuses, based on the input predetermined information identifying the relay Internet facsimile apparatus.

P20746. A02

Further, MORI does not disclose a relay Internet facsimile apparatus which stores a plurality of IP addresses of "the receiving Internet facsimile apparatuses" corresponding to the plurality of the sub-addresses of "the receiving Internet facsimile apparatuses". Rather, MORI discloses the repeater Internet facsimile machine FI1 which has a parameter memory 3 that stores the sub-address received from the ordinary (i.e., not Internet) facsimile machine FX1 and the corresponding e-mail address of the repeater Internet facsimile apparatus FI2 (col. 3, lines 27-34). The sub-address indicates the telephone number of the final destination terminal FX2 (col. 3, lines 35-39). In other words, the repeater Internet facsimile machine FI1 of MORI stores the sub-address of "the ordinary facsimile machine FX2" and the corresponding e-mail address of "the repeater Internet facsimile apparatus FI2". The repeater Internet facsimile apparatus is clearly a different machine from the ordinary facsimile machine FX2, as shown in Fig.3A. Thus, MORI does not disclose the relay Internet facsimile apparatus which stores a plurality of IP addresses of "the receiving Internet facsimile apparatuses" corresponding to the plurality of the sub-addresses of "the receiving Internet facsimile apparatuses".

On the other hand, the present invention recites the relay Internet facsimile apparatus which stores a plurality of IP addresses of the receiving Internet facsimile apparatuses corresponding to the plurality of the sub-addresses of the receiving Internet facsimile apparatuses.

Thus, the pending claims are clearly distinguished over MORI.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the features recited in Applicant's claims 11-17 are not disclosed in MORI cited by the Examiner.

P20746. A02

IZAWA et al. relates to a facsimile apparatus which executes a broadcasting function or a polling function. IZAWA et al. also discloses a plurality of one-touch buttons.

However, IZAWA et al. relates to an ordinary facsimile apparatus, but does not relate to an Internet facsimile apparatus. Thus, IZAWA et al. does not disclose a facsimile apparatus which transmits image data via a relay Internet facsimile apparatus to a plurality of receiving Internet facsimile apparatuses.

For the same reason, IZAWA et al. does not disclose a facsimile apparatus which inputs predetermined information identifying the relay Internet facsimile apparatus and a plurality of sub-addresses of the receiving Internet facsimile apparatuses. IZAWA et al. also does not disclose a facsimile apparatus which, when the predetermined information and the plurality of the sub-addresses of the receiving Internet facsimile apparatuses are input by the panel, transmits, to the relay Internet facsimile apparatus, the input image data and the plurality of the input sub-addresses of the receiving Internet facsimile apparatuses, based on the input predetermined information identifying the relay Internet facsimile apparatus.

On the other hand, the present invention recites a facsimile apparatus which transmits image data via a relay Internet facsimile apparatus to a plurality of receiving Internet facsimile apparatuses, inputs predetermined information identifying the relay Internet facsimile apparatus and a plurality of sub-addresses of the receiving Internet facsimile apparatuses, and when the predetermined information and the plurality of the sub-addresses of the receiving Internet facsimile apparatuses are input by the panel, transmits, to the relay Internet facsimile apparatus, the input image data and the

P20746. A02

plurality of the input sub-addresses of the receiving Internet facsimile apparatuses for the one facsimile transmission, based on the input predetermined information identifying the relay Internet facsimile apparatus.

Further, IZAWA et al. does contain any disclosures about the relay Internet facsimile apparatus which stores a plurality of IP addresses of the receiving Internet facsimile apparatuses corresponding to the plurality of the sub-addresses of the receiving Internet facsimile apparatuses.

In contrast, the present invention recites the relay Internet facsimile apparatus which stores a plurality of IP addresses of the receiving Internet facsimile apparatuses corresponding to the plurality of the sub-addresses of the receiving Internet facsimile apparatuses.

Thus, the pending claims are clearly distinguished over IZAWA et al.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the features recited in Applicant's claims 11-17 are not disclosed in IZAWA et al. cited by the Examiner. The pending claims are also submitted to be patentable over the Examiner's proposed combination since neither MORI, IZAWA et al., nor the combination thereof does not render obvious the combination of the above-noted features recited in Applicant's claims 11-17. In particular, the Examiner has set forth no proper motivation for the proposed combination of MORI and IZAWA et al. Further, IZAWA et al. can propose no teachings regarding "an identifier of a repeater and a sub-address of a receiver terminal" since neither repeaters nor sub-addresses are utilized therein.

P20746. A02

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and requests an indication of the allowability of all the claims pending in the present application, in due course.

P20746. A02

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Applicant has made a sincere effort to place the present application in condition for allowance and believes that he has now done so. Applicant has canceled the rejected claims and has submitted the new claims for reconsideration by the Examiner. With respect to the pending claims, Applicant has pointed out the features thereof and has contrasted the features of the new claims with the disclosures of the references. Accordingly, Applicant has provided a clear evidentiary basis supporting the patentability of all claims in the present application and respectfully requests an indication of the allowability of all the claims pending in the present application in due course.


The amendments to the claims which have been made in this amendment, which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

Should the Examiner have any questions or comments regarding this Response, or the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

June 28, 2005
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191

Respectfully submitted,
Suguru TSUCHIYA

William Pieprz
Reg. No. 33,630


Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027